

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Adder COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
PO Big 1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFERMATION NO
10/046,426	01/16/2002	Alexander Gurary	EMCORE 3.0-069	2965
530	7590 06/07/2004		EXAM	INER
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG, KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK			MOORE, KARLA A	
600 SOUTH	AVENUE WEST		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 06/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/046,426	GURARY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Karla Moore	1763	
-The MAILING DATE of this commun	nication appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address	
Therefore, further action by the applicant is n final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Not Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CF	be either: (1) a timely filed amendme	application. A proper reply to a	
PERI	OD FOR REPLY [check either a) or	b))	
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from	the mailing date of the final rejection.		
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRS 706.07(f)	or reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from t IT REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTH	IS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR foe have been filled is the date for purposes of determinate fee under 37 CFR 1 17(a) is calculated from: (1) the exc (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply recei	ing the period of extension and the correspon	ding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension	

A Notice of Appeal was filed on	Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in

- 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
  - (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise they issue of new matter (see Note below):
  - (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
    NOTE:
- Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_\_.
- 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
- 5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: \_\_\_\_\_.
- 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
- 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:

8. The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner

9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_ 10. ☑ Other: See Continuation Sheet

P. Hassing Charine

## Continuation of 10. Other:

The declarations submitted have been used to pre-date a reference (Chiang) cited in rejections included in both the non-final and final rejections of the application. The declarations presented would have been relevant as of the non-final rejection. The affidavit will not be considered because good and sufficient reasons they it was not earlier presented have not been shown on the end of the considered because good and sufficient reasons they it was not earlier presented have not been shown.

Additionally, with respect to Applicants argument that the combination of Tung and Chiang involves hindsight, Examiner disagrees. Tung teaches the missing feature and provides sound and retined all examing why one of ordinary shall in the air would have wanted to provide cylindrical shutter with an internal temperature-regulating or over-ending completely around a ventor carrier in Chiang. The fact that the shutter of Chains of its movable does not discount this responsible.